

An American Citizen Expresses Himself to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter written by one of my constituents to me as his Representative in Congress.

My constituent has expressed himself in a manner indicative of his study of each item of legislation that reflects not only knowledge, but a great deal of thinking on his part as an informed citizen. I am happy to receive letters that express reasons for these positions. Also, the fact that I have always tried to represent not only this constituent, but the great majority in my district who feel the very same way as Mr. Smith. This letter is so well done that I have attached the importance to it of inserting it in the RECORD so that everyone could have an opportunity to read the expressions of a citizen on matters so vitally affecting all Americans.

The article follows:

BALDWIN, N.Y.,
June 21, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKER: During the next few months there are many bills which will be considered for passage by the House of Representatives. I would like, at this time to acquaint you with my convictions on certain bills as proposed by the administration.

1. Aid to education: It appears that the requested sum is far in excess of the actual need. The so-called "crisis" has been created and contrived by strong lobby groups. They have done their work well. It would seem obvious to any thinking person that once initiated the program would be never ending. The States and local governments would then depend and rely on the Federal handouts. The most frightening aspect of this whole program is the inevitable Government control. The Office of Education has openly indicated that they intend to exercise and to effect their influence on our educational programs. This control would be to the detriment and even to the exclusion of public educational thought. I feel that a very cruel hoax is being played on an unsuspecting public.

As far as aid to private parochial schools is concerned, I am unalterably opposed to this sort of aid in any form. Parochial schools are created for propagation of the faith involved and were not erected as a supplement to the public school system. A taxpayer has no control over a parochial private curriculum, teachers cost of operations, methods of study, etc. Thus, no public money should be used for a function over which they exercise no control. I oppose any action in this direction most strenuously.

2. Omnibus housing: On the surface the bill has all the earmarks of a grandiose giveaway. How anyone could seriously entertain the use of a 40-year mortgage on a \$15,000 house to a person earning \$4,000 to \$6,000 a year is beyond my comprehension. The survival life of the house is less than length of the mortgage. I find it difficult to presume that a bank would enter upon a mortgage agreement of this type regardless of the interest involved. The other portions of this bill have not been spelled out

explicitly in our newspapers but have all the appearance of an inflationary program. Any information you could forward on this bill would be appreciated.

3. Foreign aid: We, I believe, have reached the point where we must, for survival's sake, look realistically at this program. In the past we have literally thrown money into a bottomless pit of waste, inefficient management, pet projects, support of nations which do not deserve same, ad infinitum. We must, in my opinion, change our thinking on this subject. I will support aid to any and all nations upon whom we can rely in a crisis. These nations do not include Yugoslavia, Poland, Egypt, and India. To support a Communist-controlled nation in hopes that the people will eventually revolt or a democratic system will somehow evolve is pure wishful thinking. The aid never gets to the people in the form intended and rulers like Tito, Nasser, and Nehru are past masters at the art of being neutral and playing both ends against the middle. The theory in favor of foreign aid is that if you keep the recipient nation in good condition economically, socially, and morally, they will not fall prey to communism. But what is generally forgotten is that the nation must possess the will and vigor to resist communism, to better themselves and to raise their standard of living. If we support a government that does not possess this will, then I submit our aid is valueless. Let us keep close watch and inspection to see that our money is put to good use, that it gets to the right place, and most of all, to all the people. I approve of aid to Latin American and newly founded nations of Africa. I think that the \$4.8 billion is greatly in excess of what is needed, particularly if moneys to the undeserving nations is eliminated.

Domestically I fear that our Government is becoming too centralized, too bureaucratic, too all-encompassing in its control over the individual. The Government exercises their influence upon every phase of our existence, whether it has the right and prerogative to do so. The best way to destroy individual initiative is to keep giving the people more and more of these so-called free social benefits. I frankly like to think that I can take care of myself in all respects. If I work hard, save my money, and prosper why should I be forced to share my fortune through some giveaway scheme I do not want nor need? Federal aid to education, housing, or health and welfare as proposed through social security. A person is only kidding himself when they believe that they get all these benefits for nothing. Not only does it result in inflation, increased taxes, but for worse—Government control.

Our strongest weapon in this cold war is the ability to stay solvent and we are not doing a very good job at the present. We are fiscally irresponsible and if we ran our business as does the Government bankruptcy would have come long ago. The President has asked us to think in terms of that which I can do for the Government—whereas his programs are all based on what the Government can do for us.

4. Lastly on foreign policy: When do we stop using the soft approach regarding communism? When do we stop retreating? Where do we make a stand? I realize that war is abhorrent but dying inch by inch is infinitely worse. History is replete with examples of appeasement and its inevitable results. Let us stand up to the Kremlin.

Every time we have displayed determination to resist, they have backed down. When we do not persevere, they take over. Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba are pertinent examples. Most recently Senator MANSFIELD made a speech regarding the making of Berlin into a free city. I would like to make it very clear that I do not approve of giving in an iota on West Berlin, regardless of the consequences.

If Berlin goes, so goes the symbol of Western resistance in Europe. What hope would captured nations have for revolution if they realize we cannot be depended upon in a crisis? It would be an open invitation to Mr. K. that we can be bullied anywhere at any time. This must not happen.

I realize that many have said that Laos, etc., are not places to do battle effectively. The terrain, climate and facilities are bad. I would like to know just where the book of rules indicates that a battle is to be fought on a flat polo field with access to all supplies and support. It seems that Korea, Iwo Jima, Anzio, etc., were not fought under the best of circumstances. If we wait for the most strategic spot to make a stand I'm afraid we will shortly run out of places to defend.

In conclusion, let our foreign policy be based on what is good for the United States, and not necessarily what is good for the rest of the world. Let us fight the Communists using their biggest weapon, propaganda. Let us constantly ask for free elections in suppressed lands. Let us build up the image of our country to reflect friendship and dependability and not as an affluent benefactor. Let us support uprisings in suppressed lands. Put Mr. Khrushchev on the defensive. In short let's act like we are in a battle for survival. Too many of our people sit supinely by waiting for some one else to do the job, too interested in material wants to care for their freedom. Let us awaken them.

I wish to congratulate you on the job you have been doing in the House. I am appreciative of our periodic mailings and enjoy reading your articles locally in the Baldwin Citizen. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT T. SMITH.

The Freedom Academy—Senator Keating's Suggestion Merits Immediate Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in a recent commencement address, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], devoted his remarks to the vital need of an educational program for the young people of America so that they can adequately understand the evils of communism.

I regret that I do not have the text of the Senator's remarks, however, I do have two editorials from the Troy, N.Y., newspapers which have thoughtfully analyzed and favorably commented on his proposal. The editorials are worthy of the attention of my colleagues, and I request permission that they be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it has been my opportunity to serve with my colleague, Senator KEATING, in the Congress for more than a dozen years. I have, on many occasions, discussed with him and worked with him on these problems confronting us from the Communist conspiracy.

Only recently, we have devoted considerably of our time and effort on a proposal—which we jointly sponsor along with a number of other Senators—to establish a Freedom Academy, an institution which would be devoted to the training of not only Government personnel but private citizens as well in the complex art of psychological warfare.

While I do not intend at this time to discuss the Freedom Academy measure, I point out that one of the end results which would accrue from the establishment of the academy would be well-trained experts who not only would understand every facet of the Communist conspiracy but would be able to activate and direct programs of counteraction against the Communists. It would, in a sense, put freedom on the offensive in this cold war struggle in which we are deeply involved.

The Freedom Academy would not be an institution in which every American would enroll, and it is with this understanding, I am certain, that the distinguished Senator from New York has now proposed that we also direct our attention to the millions of young Americans now in our elementary schools.

Certainly we cannot expect to successfully ward off the Communists' insidious efforts to subvert America if we do not understand what they are about. And I share the concern of the Senator from New York that if we do not direct our attention to the young people of America and alert them to this threat, tell them what communism really is and how it would destroy our way of life, we will be abdicating one of the great responsibilities that has been thrust upon this generation.

Mr. President, the suggestion of Senator KEATING merits the attention of all who are concerned with the future of our country. I hope that those who are now serving the cause of education so faithfully in the classroom, and their representatives in the various associations on the State level—and national as well—will turn their attention to the recommendation made by our colleague from New York. It merits earnest and early consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Times Record,
June 13, 1961]

COMMUNIST COURSES ESSENTIAL

Senator KEATING, like many others, suggests that we place more emphasis on teaching the evils of communism in our schools and colleges. He proposes "a mighty campaign to educate our young people" about the perils of international communism.

The people who prepare the school curriculums do not appear to have been taking swiftly to the suggestion. Certainly such a course is as important as many of the electives taught in the schools.

Let us start with the point of view that communism is one of our gravest dangers. We should not have to be convinced of this

when we watch the developments in Laos, Latin America, and other places.

We tell our small children not to play with matches and to stay away from fires. We explain that they are apt to drown if they wade in the deep water. The responsible parent warns that one should cross the street only at the traffic light. These little truisms of life we take for granted as we try to forewarn our children. When our country is filled with spies and the Reds are harassing us at every turn, we should take the time and effort to apprise the young generation of these dangers.

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Morning Record,
June 14, 1961]

TEACH THEM EARLY

Senator KEATING, in making a commencement address, proposed a "mighty campaign to educate our young people" about the perils of international communism. This has been suggested by several and various groups on times, but it bears repeating.

We seem to move slowly in adopting good practices. This suggestion of teaching the dangers of communism in secondary schools and colleges does not appear to have been picked up swiftly by the pedagogues and added to the curriculum.

We do not know why it takes so long to sell this idea, yet as we peruse the school material given our youngsters, we notice no rush to include the theme. We think it most important to give more emphasis to this topic. One has only to examine the record to become alarmed about the Communist advances. We are always losing more territory to them. We lose out because we believe on playing the game of international politics honestly. The Russians try every sneaky trick in the book. Thus our country is infiltrated by hundreds of Russian spies. They operate boldly despite the efforts of the FBI and other security agencies to keep them in check. We hope that the recent Supreme Court decision requiring that Communist Party members register, will be an aid in keeping subversives out in public view where they can be watched.

Communism is one of the chief perils of our society. We have been harassed at the moment by the operations of the Reds. Mr. Kennedy, eager to become an efficient President, already has his ardor dampened by the harassment of Mr. Khrushchev and company.

So if communism is one of our chief dangers, why not tell the future citizens about it early? We teach them not to play with matches, to cross at street corners, and not to go near bodies of water where they might drown.

Therefore when they are old enough to understand and are going through the era when political philosophies appeal to them, they should be given a good dosage of the evils of communism. During his first or second year in college, the average student explores Marxism and all the other isms. He finds some of the bold ideals refreshing. He is tired of hearing about the glories of the United States and enjoys those "bull sessions" where he can startle his colleagues and get a little attention by professing to be disciple of Joseph Stalin. Of course he is talking through his hat and will soon get back to reading his philosophy assignments and forget all about "Old Joe."

But we should not take the young generation for granted. They do not know the insidious things about communism which we know. And a new, uninformed generation rises swiftly. We should meet it with the knowledge required to keep our country safe. There should be a rousing chapter on the evils of communism in every textbook.

Dedication of New Milwaukee Railroad Bridge Across the Missouri River at Mobridge, S. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, evidence of the changing face of South Dakota is the new Milwaukee Railroad bridge across the Missouri River at Mobridge, S. Dak. I was honored to have a part in the dedication of this bridge, in which the Federal Government has a substantial investment, on July 3.

The new bridge was built to replace a section of the transcontinental line which will be flooded by the Oahe Reservoir.

Mr. V. S. Glosup, assistant vice president and chief engineer for the railroad, gave the dedication address at the ceremony. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here a portion of his speech:

ADDRESS BY MR. V. E. GLOSUP, ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT-CHIEF ENGINEER, AT CEREMONIES DEDICATING THE NEW MILWAUKEE ROAD BRIDGE OVER THE MISSOURI RIVER AT MOBRIDGE, S. DAK., JULY 3, 1961

We of the Milwaukee Road are pleased to have a part in today's ceremonies marking the completion of a big undertaking—the spanning of the Missouri River with a new bridge. That is because we feel that we are a vital part of your community and of the State of South Dakota.

We have grown up together in this area as partners, and what affects you affects us. We are happy to share in your triumphs and likewise are happy to share our triumphs with you. The culmination of all the work involved in spanning the Missouri with a new bridge is a triumph, not only in engineering, but in cooperation to the highest degree.

Construction is a tangible sign of progress. The building of the new Milwaukee Road bridge, its approaches, and the relocating of several miles of its track are not only signs of progress, but they reflect the results of other progress.

By other progress I mean the construction of Oahe Dam near Pierre. The purposes in building the dam spell out progress, a physical result of which will be the creation of a vast reservoir of water to be impounded behind the dam stretching far upstream. The necessity of straddling the reservoir waters here is what brought about the construction of the new Milwaukee Road bridge.

One of the most important ingredients of successful construction is teamwork, and I know of few instances in my experience where teamwork has been so outstanding as in the \$18 million project whose completion we are marking today.

Nothing can stand still; progress always involves change. Even in the short span of the last few years railroading itself has undergone great changes. You have seen it and you will see more.

You have seen the powerful, sleek, efficient diesel supplant the snorting steam engine. You have seen containers, part of our Flexi-Van trailer-on-flatcar system, on